

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

Chandra Wade,

Plaintiff,

v.

Citibank NA,

Defendant.

Civil Action No.: _____

COMPLAINT

For this Complaint, Plaintiff, Chandra Wade, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This action arises out of Defendant's repeated violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* (the "TCPA").
2. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that Defendant transacts business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

3. Plaintiff, Chandra Wade ("Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in Memphis, Tennessee, and is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39).
4. Defendant, Citibank NA ("Citibank"), is a New York business entity with an address of 399 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10043, and is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39).

FACTS

5. Within the last year, Citibank began calling Plaintiff's cellular telephone, number 901-xxx-4928, using an automatic telephone dialing system ("ATDS" or "predictive dialer") and/or using an artificial or prerecorded voice.

6. When Plaintiff answered calls from Citibank, she heard a prerecorded message.

7. In or around June 2016, Plaintiff informed Citibank that the account had been included in a debt consolidation and to cease all calls to her.

8. Nevertheless, Citibank continued to place automated calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone number.

COUNT I
VIOLATIONS OF THE TCPA –
47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq.

9. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

10. At all times mentioned herein, Defendant called Plaintiff's cellular telephone number using an ATDS or predictive dialer and/or by using a prerecorded or artificial voice.

11. Defendant continued to place automated calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone number despite knowing that it lacked consent to do so. As such, each call placed to Plaintiff was made in knowing and/or willful violation of the TCPA, and subject to treble damages pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

12. The telephone number called by Defendant was assigned to a cellular telephone serviced by AT&T for which Plaintiff incurs charges pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

13. Plaintiff was annoyed, harassed and inconvenienced by Defendant's continued calls.

14. The calls from Defendant to Plaintiff were not placed for "emergency purposes" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(i).

15. Plaintiff is entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages for each call placed in violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).

16. Plaintiff is entitled to an award of treble damages in an amount up to \$1,500.00

pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully prays that judgment be awarded in Plaintiff's favor and against Defendant as follows:

1. Statutory damages of \$500.00 for each violation determined to be negligent pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B);
2. Treble damages for each violation determined to be willful and/or knowing pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C); and
3. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: January 17, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Sergei Lemberg
Sergei Lemberg, Esq. (SL 6331)
LEMBERG LAW, L.L.C.
43 Danbury Road, 3rd Floor
Wilton, CT 06897
Telephone: (203) 653-2250
Facsimile: (203) 653-3424
Attorneys for Plaintiff